

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,684	02/06/2004	Paul A. Lotke	4323-P03363US0	7807
110	7590 09/19/2006		EXAMINER	
DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN 1601 MARKET STREET			SNOW, BRUC	CE EDWARD
SUITE 2400	of Street		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PHILADELPI	HIA, PA 19103-2307		3738	

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/773,684	LOTKE, PAUL A.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Bruce E. Snow	3738				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 A	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 August 2006</u> .					
· ·	•					
· <u> </u>						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5,14-24 and 50-94</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5,14-24 and 50-94</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> </ol>						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Burea	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)				
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/01/06.</li> </ol>	6) Other:					

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/26/06 have been fully considered. It is noted that the claim numbering skips claim 65 and claim 78 is misnumbered as claim 70; applicant is required to correct these informalities.

Merchant teaches two embodiments of a femoral prosthesis, 182 and 186. The Examiner would like to see more arguments why applicant believes their claims define over Merchant. Why does applicant's claims 50, 69, or 78 define over embodiment 182 of Merchant?

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 64 depends from cancelled claim 6.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 50-58, 69-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Merchant (6,616,696).

Merchant teaches various embodiments of a femoral prosthesis; some embodiments such as 130, 182, and 188 have a trochlear groove and a portion that covers the intercondylar notch as claimed;

50. (Currently Amended) A femoral prosthesis, consisting essentially of:

a body having a posterior surface configured to overlie a portion of the trochlear groove and an anterior surface forming a groove that is configured to cooperate with a posterior surface of a patellar prosthesis; and

an intercondylar notch portion connected with the body portion, wherein the intercondylar notch portion has outer edges that terminate so that the intercondylar notch

portion is configured to overlie at least a portion of the intercondylar notch without substantially extending over an articular surface between of a condyle and the tibia.

Regarding the depending claims, see the embodiment 186.

Applicant is reminded of their use of the transistionary phrase "comprising" which can include other limitations.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5, 14-24, 50-94 (all claims) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious Aram et al (2006/0058884).

Aram et al teaches various embodiments, referring to all figures, specifically figure 14, Aram et al teaches:

84. (New) A knee prosthesis for covering a portion of a patient's (patella), and trochlear groove and intercondylar notch of the femur, comprising:

(a patellar prosthesis configured to cover a posterior surface of a patella), and a femoral prosthesis comprising:

a body 104 having a posterior surface configured to cover a portion of the trochlear groove and an anterior surface forming a groove that is cooperable with the posterior surface of the patellar prosthesis;

a medial extension (106 or 108) projecting away from a distal end of the body configured to extend along a medial edge of the intercondylar notch; and

a lateral extension (the other 106 or 108) projecting away from a distal end of the body configured to extend along a lateral edge of the intercondylar notch;

a separate condyle prosthesis (136 or 130) configured to cover an articular surface of a condyle, wherein the condyle prosthesis has an inner edge configured to cooperate with an outer edge of the either the medial or lateral extension.

In the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) when a patellar prosthesis is positively claimed: It is unclear if Aram et al teaches a patellar prosthesis. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use a patellar prosthesis in combination with the femoral prosthesis of Aubaniac when deemed necessary by the surgeon to repair the knee joint with a damaged or disease patella.

Claims 14-24, 50-58, 69-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Aubaniac (WO 87/02882, applicant submitted on IDS dated 8/01/06).

Aubaniac teaches various embodiments, referring to all figures, specifically figures 21-24, Aubaniac teaches:

84. (New) A knee prosthesis for covering a portion of a patient's (patella), and trochlear groove and intercondylar notch of the femur, comprising:

(a patellar prosthesis configured to cover a posterior surface of a patella), and a femoral prosthesis comprising:

Application/Control Number: 10/773,684

Art Unit: 3738

a body 1 having a posterior surface configured to cover a portion of the trochlear groove and an anterior surface forming a groove that is cooperable with the posterior surface of the patellar prosthesis;

a medial extension (8 or 9) projecting away from a distal end of the body configured to extend along a medial edge of the intercondylar notch; and

a lateral extension (the other of 8 or 9) projecting away from a distal end of the body configured to extend along a lateral edge of the intercondylar notch;

(regarding at least claim 84, Aubaniac teaches) a separate condyle prosthesis (2 or 3) configured to cover an articular surface of a condyle, wherein the condyle prosthesis has an inner edge configured to cooperate with an outer edge of the either the medial or lateral extension.

In the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a): It is unclear if Aubaniac teaches a patellar prosthesis. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use any patellar prosthesis known in the art in combination with the femoral prosthesis of Aubaniac when deemed necessary by the surgeon to repair the knee joint with a damaged or disease patella.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruce E. Snow whose telephone number is (571) 272-4759. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571) 272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/773,684 Page 7

Art Unit: 3738

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

bes

BRUCE SNOW PRIMARY EXAMINER